



DOCKET NO. US 010606
CLIENT NO. PHIL06-10606

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Nevenka Dimitrova, et al.
Serial No.: 09/995,471
Filed: November 28, 2001
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR RETRIEVING
INFORMATION RELATED TO TARGETED SUBJECTS
Group No.: 3627
Examiner: Ronald Laneau

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

The Appellants have appealed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the decision of the Examiner dated November 29, 2004, finally rejecting Claims 1-15, 17-26, and 28-39. The Appellants filed a Notice of Appeal on February 28, 2005, which was received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 4, 2005. The Appellants respectfully submit this brief on appeal with the appropriate statutory fee.

The Appellants also respectfully request a two (2) month extension of time for filing this brief. The period for filing this brief now expires on July 4, 2005 (which is a federal holiday), so this brief may be timely filed on July 5, 2005.

07/25/2005 SLUANG1 00000009-09995471

FC:1402

500.00 DP

07/25/2005 SLUANG1 00000009 09995471

01 FC:1402

500.00 DP

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

This application is currently owned by Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. as indicated by an assignment recorded on November 28, 2001 in the Assignment Records of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 012334, Frame 0699.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no known appeals or interferences that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this pending appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-15, 17-26, and 28-39 have been rejected pursuant to a final Office Action dated November 29, 2004. Claims 16 and 27 have been cancelled. Claims 1-15, 17-26, and 28-39 are presented for appeal. A copy of Claims 1-15, 17-26, and 28-39 is provided in the Appendix.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were submitted and refused entry after issuance of the final Office Action dated November 29, 2004.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Regarding Claim 1, an information tracker 20, 100 includes a content analyzer 25, which includes a memory 29 for storing content data received from an information source 50 and a processor 27 for executing a set of machine-readable instructions for analyzing the content data according to query criteria. (*Application, Page 5, Lines 14-20; Page 7, Lines 9-20*). The information tracker 20, 100 also includes an input device 120 communicatively connected to the content analyzer 25 for permitting a user to interact with the content analyzer 25. (*Application, Page 8, Lines 2-8*). The information tracker 20, 100 further includes a display device 115 communicatively connected to the content analyzer 25 for displaying a result of analysis of the content data performed by the content analyzer 25. (*Application, Page 20, Line 22 – Page 21, Line 6*). According to the set of machine-readable instructions, the processor 27 of the content analyzer 25 analyzes the content data to extract and index one or more stories related to the query criteria. (*Application, Page 17, Line 19 – Page 20, Line 2*). A person spotting function of the machine-readable instructions extracts faces, speech, and text from the content data, makes a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, makes a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scans the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculates a probability of a particular person being present in the content data based on the first, second, and third matches. (*Application, Page 9, Line 21 – Page 10, Line 6; Page 3, Lines 17-22*).

Regarding Claim 26, a method of retrieving information related to a targeted subject includes receiving a video source from an information source 50 into a memory 29 of a content analyzer 25. (*Application, Page 5, Lines 14-20; Page 7, Lines 9-20*). The method also includes analyzing the

video source to recognize persons and extract stories from the video source using a query criteria. (*Application, Page 8, Line 11 – Page 9, Line 14*). The query criteria include a user profile and a knowledge base stored in the content analyzer 25. (*Application, Page 8, Lines 12-16*). Analyzing the video source includes extracting faces, speech, and text from the video source, making a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, making a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scanning the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculating a probability of a particular person being present in the video source based on the first, second, and third matches. (*Application, Page 9, Line 21 – Page 10, Line 6; Page 3, Lines 17-22*). In addition, the method includes indexing the extracted stories according to temporal and causal relationships and displaying indexed results of the analysis of the video source. (*Application, Page 19, Line 8 – Page 20, Line 2; Page 20, Line 22 – Page 21, Line 18*).

Regarding Claim 36, a method of retrieving information related to a targeted subject includes receiving information from a user into a content analyzer 25, where the information is related to the user's interests. (*Application, Page 8, Lines 2-8*). The method also includes receiving first content data into the content analyzer 25. (*Application, Page 5, Lines 1-6*). The method further includes analyzing the first content data to extract a story relevant to the information received from the user. (*Application, Page 8, Line 11 – Page 9, Line 14*). Analyzing the first content data includes extracting faces, speech, and text from the first content data, making a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, making a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scanning the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculating a probability of a particular person being present in the first content data based on the first, second, and third matches.

(Application, Page 9, Line 21 – Page 10, Line 6; Page 3, Lines 17-22). In addition, the method includes displaying a link to the story so as to make the story accessible to the user. *(Application, Page 20, Line 22 – Page 21, Line 6).*

Regarding Claim 39, an information tracking retrieval system 20 includes a centrally located content analyzer 25 in communication with a storage device 30. *(Application, Page 5, Lines 14-15).* The content analyzer 25 is accessible to a plurality of users and information sources 50 via at least one communications network 200. *(Application, Page 5, Lines 12-13; Page 6, Lines 10-15).* The content analyzer 25 is programmed with a set of machine-readable instructions to receive first content data into the content analyzer 25, receive a request from at least one of the users, analyze the first content data to extract one or more stories relevant to the request, and provide access to the one or more stories. *(Application, Page 5, Lines 1-6; Page 8, Line 11 – Page 9, Line 14; Page 20, Line 22 – Page 21, Line 6).* The first content data is analyzed by extracting faces, speech, and text from the first content data, making a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, making a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scanning the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculating a probability of a particular person being present in the first content data based on the first, second, and third matches. *(Application, Page 9, Line 21 – Page 10, Line 6; Page 3, Lines 17-22).*

GROUND OF REJECTION

1. Claims 1-15, 17-19, 26, and 28-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,835,667 to Wactlar et al. ("*Wactlar*").
2. Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/39707 to Elenbaas et al. ("*Elenbaas*").
3. Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Elenbaas* and/or *Wactlar* in view of Kobayashi et al., "Information Retrieval on the Web," ACM Computing Surveys ("*Kobayashi*") and in further view of Tenopir, "Online Databases – Trends for the Next Five Years," Library Journal ("*Tenopir*").

ARGUMENT

I. GROUND OF REJECTION #1

The rejection of Claims 1-15, 17-19, 26, and 28-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper and should be withdrawn.

A. OVERVIEW

Claims 1-15, 17-19, 26, and 28-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,835,667 to Wactlar et al. ("*Wactlar*").

B. STANDARD

A prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of the claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. (*MPEP* § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. (*MPEP* § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

C. THE WACTLAR REFERENCE

Wactlar recites a system and method for creating a digital library from audio data and video images. (*Abstract*). As shown in Figure 2 of *Wactlar*, the audio data is transcribed and time-stamped, processed using natural language interpretation, and indexed. (*Figure 2; Col. 7, Lines 40-*

64; Col. 9, Lines 40-65; Col. 11, Lines 23-42). The video images are digitized and paragraphed or segmented, icons are created for the paragraphs, and the video images are compressed. (Col. 11, Lines 44-65; Col. 13, Lines 52-59; Col. 14, Lines 26-37).

D. CLAIMS 1-15, 17-19, 26, AND 28-39

Claim 1 recites an information tracker, which includes:

- a content analyzer comprising a memory for storing content data received from an information source and a processor for executing a set of machine-readable instructions for analyzing the content data according to query criteria;

- an input device communicatively connected to the content analyzer for permitting a user to interact with the content analyzer;
- and

- a display device communicatively connected to the content analyzer for displaying a result of analysis of the content data performed by the content analyzer;

- wherein, according to the set of machine-readable instructions, the processor of the content analyzer analyzes the content data to extract and index one or more stories related to the query criteria; and

- wherein a person spotting function of the machine-readable instructions extracts faces, speech, and text from the content data, makes a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, makes a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scans the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculates a probability of a particular person being present in the content data based on the first, second, and third matches.

The Examiner fails to establish that *Wactlar* anticipates all elements of Claim 1. In particular, the Examiner fails to establish that *Wactlar* anticipates a “person spotting function” that “extracts faces, speech, and text from the content data, makes a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, makes a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scans the extracted

text to make a third match to known names, and calculates a probability of a particular person being present in the content data based on the first, second, and third matches” as recited in Claim 1.

As noted above, *Wactlar* transcribes and time-stamps audio data, processes the data using natural language interpretation, and indexes the audio data. Nothing here indicates that *Wactlar* attempts to match “extracted speech” to “known voices.” Similarly, *Wactlar* digitizes, segments, and compresses video images. *Wactlar* also selects “icons,” which simply represent text and video images identifying the different segments. Nothing here indicates that *Wactlar* attempts to match “extracted faces” to “known faces.”

The Examiner asserts that Figure 6 and columns 11-13 and 17-18 of *Wactlar* anticipate these elements of Claim 1. (11/29/04 Office Action, Page 3, Last paragraph – Page 4, First paragraph). However, these portions of *Wactlar* generally recite how “image, speech and natural language information” are used to “increase the reliability of segmentation.” (Col. 12, Lines 41-51). In other words, *Wactlar* uses this information to segment an audio/video program into segments. *Wactlar* does not use the “image, speech and natural language information” to perform a “person spotting function” as recited in Claim 1. In particular, *Wactlar* does not use the image, speech and natural language information to match “known faces” to “extracted faces,” match “known voices” to “extracted speech,” match “extracted text” to “known names,” and calculate a probability based on the matches as recited in Claim 1.

Wactlar does recite that video can be scanned for other images containing the same person in a current image. (Col. 12, Lines 12-17). However, this portion of *Wactlar* lacks any mention of calculating a probability that a particular person is present in content data using three different

matches, including a “first match of known faces to the extracted faces,” a “second match of known voices to the extracted speech,” and a “third match [of extracted text] to known names” as recited in Claim 1. Rather, this portion of *Wactlar* simply indicates that a face in one image can be used to locate matching faces in other images.

Wactlar also mentions that an interview segment can be defined by locating an interviewer or interviewee using speech recognition and then determining the point at which this person disappears from a scene. (*Col. 13, Lines 1-9*). Again, this portion of *Wactlar* lacks any mention of matching “known voices” to “extracted speech,” matching “known faces” to “extracted faces,” matching “extracted text” to “known names,” and calculating a probability using the matches. Instead, this portion of *Wactlar* simply indicates that speech recognition can be used to identify a person as either conducting an interview or being interviewed. This portion of *Wactlar* contains no mention of identifying the interviewer or interviewee by comparing “known voices” to “extracted speech.” Similarly, this portion of *Wactlar* simply indicates that image recognition can be used to determine when a person (identified as an interviewer or interviewee) in a scene disappears from that scene. Nothing here indicates that the person’s face is matched to “known faces.” In addition, even though *Wactlar* may use speech recognition to locate an interviewer or interviewee and image recognition to determine when that person leaves a scene, nothing here indicates that *Wactlar* calculates a “probability” of a “particular person” being present in content data based on three different matches as recited in Claim 1.

Columns 17 and 18 of *Wactlar* recite an example of how content may be searched using “indexed transcripts of text” and how a particular person (Arthur Clarke) may appear in a video

segment. (*Col. 17, Lines 43-65*). Again, nothing here recites matching “known faces” to “extracted faces,” matching “known voices” to “extracted speech,” matching “extracted text” to “known names,” and calculating a probability using the matches as recited in Claim 1.

Figure 6 of *Wactlar* illustrates a display that includes, among other things, images from identified scene changes and indications of when speakers change. *Wactlar* specifically notes that this information is used to segment an audio/video program into segments. (*Col. 12, Lines 45-41*). Nothing in Figure 6 of *Wactlar* discloses matching “known faces” to “extracted faces,” matching “known voices” to “extracted speech,” matching “extracted text” to “known names,” and calculating a probability using the matches as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner has only shown that *Wactlar* uses speech recognition, image recognition, and text transcripts to perform various functions in the system of *Wactlar*, such as segmenting an audio/video program. The Examiner has not shown that *Wactlar* recites matching “known faces” to “extracted faces,” matching “known voices” to “extracted speech,” matching “extracted text” to “known names,” and calculating a “probability” of a “particular person” being present in content data based on the matches. As a result, the Examiner has failed to establish that *Wactlar* anticipates all elements of Claim 1.

For these reasons, the Examiner has not established that *Wactlar* anticipates the Appellants’ invention as recited in Claim 1 (and its dependent claims). For similar reasons, the Examiner has not established that *Wactlar* anticipates the Appellants’ invention as recited in Claims 26, 36, and 39 (and their dependent claims).

Accordingly, the Appellants respectfully request that the § 102 rejection of Claims 1-15, 17-

19, 26, and 28-39 be withdrawn and that Claims 1-15, 17-19, 26, and 28-39 be passed to allowance.

II. GROUND OF REJECTION #2

The rejection of Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

A. OVERVIEW

Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/39707 to Elenbaas et al. (“*Elenbaas*”).

B. STANDARD

In *ex parte* examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1262, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992)). The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention is always upon the Patent Office. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). Only when a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established does the burden shift to the Appellants to produce evidence of nonobviousness. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). If the Patent Office

does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the Appellants are entitled to grant of a patent. (*In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. (*In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on the Appellant's disclosure. (MPEP § 2142).

C. CLAIMS 20 AND 21

Claims 20 and 21 depend from Claim 1. As shown above, Claim 1 is patentable. As a result, Claims 20 and 21 are patentable due to their dependence from Claim 1.

Also, the Examiner did not reject Claim 1 as being unpatentable over *Elenbaas*. The Examiner only rejected Claim 1 as being anticipated by *Wactlar*. The Office Action provided by the Examiner on November 29, 2004 was required to be complete "as to all matters." (MPEP § 707.07). Because of this, it appears the Examiner does not believe that *Elenbaas* anticipates Claim 1 or

renders Claim 1 obvious.

Claims 20 and 21 incorporate all of the elements recited in Claim 1. If Claim 1 is not rejected as being anticipated or rendered obvious by *Elenbaas*, Claims 20 and 21 also should not be rejected as being anticipated or rendered obvious by *Elenbaas*.

For these reasons, the Examiner fails to establish that *Elenbaas* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of Claims 20 and 21. Accordingly, the Appellants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of Claims 20 and 21 be withdrawn and that Claims 20 and 21 be passed to allowance.

III. GROUND OF REJECTION #3

The rejection of Claims 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

A. OVERVIEW

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Elenbaas* and/or *Wactlar* in view of Kobayashi et al., “Information Retrieval on the Web,” ACM Computing Surveys (“*Kobayashi*”) and in further view of Tenopir, “Online Databases – Trends for the Next Five Years,” Library Journal (“*Tenopir*”).

B. CLAIMS 22-25

Claims 22-25 depend from Claim 1. As shown above, Claim 1 is patentable. As a result,

Claims 22-25 are patentable due to their dependence from Claim 1.

Accordingly, the Appellants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of Claims 22-25 be withdrawn and that Claims 22-25 be passed to allowance.

SUMMARY

The Appellants have demonstrated that the present invention as claimed is clearly distinguishable over the prior art cited of record. Therefore, the Appellants respectfully request the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to reverse the final rejection of the Examiner and instruct the Examiner to issue a notice of allowance of all claims.

The Appellants have enclosed the appropriate fee to cover the cost of this APPEAL BRIEF and a two (2) month extension of time. The Appellants do not believe that any additional fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees (including any additional extension of time fees) or credit any overpayments to Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: _____

July 5, 2005



William A. Munck

Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: wmunck@davismunck.com

APPENDIX

PENDING CLAIMS

1. An information tracker, comprising:
 - a content analyzer comprising a memory for storing content data received from an information source and a processor for executing a set of machine-readable instructions for analyzing the content data according to query criteria;
 - an input device communicatively connected to the content analyzer for permitting a user to interact with the content analyzer; and
 - a display device communicatively connected to the content analyzer for displaying a result of analysis of the content data performed by the content analyzer;wherein, according to the set of machine-readable instructions, the processor of the content analyzer analyzes the content data to extract and index one or more stories related to the query criteria; and
 - wherein a person spotting function of the machine-readable instructions extracts faces, speech, and text from the content data, makes a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, makes a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scans the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculates a probability of a particular person being present in the content data based on the first, second, and third matches.
2. The information tracker of claim 1, wherein the processor of the content analyzer uses the query criteria to spot a subject in the content data, extract one or more stories from the content data, resolve and inference names in the extracted one or more stories, and display a link to the extracted one or more stories on the display device.
3. The information tracker of claim 2, wherein, in addition to displaying the link to the extracted one or more stories, the content analyzer displays one or more links to one or more shopping web-sites such that the user can purchase goods related to the subject.
4. The information tracker of claim 2, wherein the names in the extracted stories are resolved and inferred using an ontology.
5. The information tracker of claim 2, wherein, if more than one story is extracted, the processor indexes the stories according to name, topic, and keyword.
6. The information tracker of claim 5, wherein the stories are further ordered based on a causality relationship.
7. The information tracker of claim 5, wherein the stories are further ordered based on a temporal relationship.

8. The information tracker of claim 1, wherein the query criteria includes a request input by the user through the input device and the processor analyzes the content data according to the request.

9. The information tracker of claim 8, wherein the content analyzer further comprises a user profile, which includes information about the user's interests, and the query criteria includes the user profile.

10. The information tracker of claim 9, wherein the user profile is updated by integrating information in the request with existing information in the user profile.

11. The information tracker of claim 8, wherein the content analyzer further comprises a knowledge base, which includes a plurality of known relationships, and the processor analyzes the content data according to the knowledge base.

12. The information tracker of claim 11, wherein one type of the known relationships is a map of a known face to a name.

13. The information tracker of claim 11, wherein one type of the known relationships is a map of a known voice to a name.

14. The information tracker of claim 11, wherein one type of the known relationships is a map of a name to various related information.

15. The information tracker of claim 5, wherein the content analyzer further comprises:
a user profile, which includes information about the user's interests;
a knowledge base which includes a plurality of known relationships including a map of known faces and voices to names and other related information; and
wherein the query criteria includes the user profile and the knowledge base.

16. (Cancelled).

17. The information tracker of claim 1, wherein the content data is a video signal.

18. The information tracker of claim 17, wherein the information source is a cable television provider.

19. The information tracker of claim 17, wherein the information source is a satellite television provider.

20. The information tracker of claim 1, wherein the content data is an audio signal.

21. The information tracker of claim 20, wherein the information source is a radio station.
22. The information tracker of claim 1, wherein the content analyzer is communicatively connected to a second information source for providing access to additional content data, the additional content data being analyzed for relevant stories.
23. The information tracker of claim 22, wherein the additional content data is analyzed according to a first approach wherein terms are extracted from the query criteria and used to pose a search request of the second information source and a second approach wherein one or more sites provided by the second information are scanned for matching stories.
24. The information tracker of claim 23, wherein intersection stories are those matching stories which were retrieved as a result of both the first and second approaches.
25. The information tracker of claim 22, wherein the relevant stories found in the additional content data are compared to find any intersection stories.
26. A method of retrieving information related to a targeted subject, the method comprising:
 - receiving a video source from an information source into a memory of a content analyzer;
 - analyzing the video source to recognize persons and extract stories from the video source using a query criteria, the query criteria comprising a user profile and a knowledge base stored in the content analyzer, wherein analyzing the video source comprises extracting faces, speech, and text from the video source, making a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, making a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scanning the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculating a probability of a particular person being present in the video source based on the first, second, and third matches;
 - indexing the extracted stories according to temporal and causal relationships; and
 - displaying indexed results of the analysis of the video source.
27. (Cancelled).
28. The method of claim 26 wherein the analyzing of the video source to extract stories comprises segmenting the video source into visual, audio and textual components, fusing the information, segmenting and annotating the story internally, and inferencing the information.
29. The method of claim 26, wherein the indexing of the extracted stories comprises indexing the extracted stories alphabetically.
30. The method of claim 26, wherein the indexing of the extracted stories comprises indexing the extracted stories by topic.

31. The method of claim 26, wherein the indexing of the extracted stories comprises indexing the extracted stories according to keywords matching the query criteria.

32. The method of claim 26, wherein the indexing of the extracted stories comprises extracting a causality relationship.

33. The method of claim 26, wherein the indexing of the extracted stories comprises extracting a temporal relationship.

34. The method of claim 26, wherein the indexing of the extracted stories comprises indexing the extracted stories according to a pre-determined criteria, extracting a causality relationship, extracting a temporal relationship, calculating a rating for each of the extracted stories from one or more characteristics of the extracted stories, and prioritizing the extracted stories.

35. The method of claim 34, further comprising creating a hyperlinked index to the extracted stories and storing the hyperlinked index.

36. A method of retrieving information related to a targeted subject, the method comprising:

- receiving information from a user into a content analyzer, the information related to the user's interests;

- receiving first content data into the content analyzer;

- analyzing the first content data to extract a story relevant to the information received from the user, wherein analyzing the first content data comprises extracting faces, speech, and text from the first content data, making a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, making a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scanning the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculating a probability of a particular person being present in the first content data based on the first, second, and third matches; and

- displaying a link to the story so as to make the story accessible to the user.

37. The method of claim 36, further comprising accessing second content data and searching the second content data for relevant information.

38. The method of claim 36, wherein the content analyzer is centrally located and the user accesses the content analyzer via a communications network.

39. A information tracking retrieval system, comprising:
a centrally located content analyzer in communication with a storage device, the content analyzer being accessible to a plurality of users and information sources via at least one communications network, and the content analyzer being programmed with a set of machine-readable instructions to:
- receive first content data into the content analyzer;
 - receive a request from at least one of the users;
 - analyze the first content data to extract one or more stories relevant to the request by extracting faces, speech, and text from the first content data, making a first match of known faces to the extracted faces, making a second match of known voices to the extracted speech, scanning the extracted text to make a third match to known names, and calculating a probability of a particular person being present in the first content data based on the first, second, and third matches; and
 - provide access to the one or more stories.